REMARKS

These remarks are made in response to the final Office Action of June 16, 2004 (Office Action). As this response is timely filed within the 3-month shortened statutory period, no fee is believed due.

In paragraph 2, claims 16 and 23 have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75 as being of improper dependent form for failing to further limit the subject matter of the previous claim. In response, claims 15 and 22 have been amended so as to no longer include the limitations stated in claims 16 and 23. Responsive to this amendment, withdrawal of the objections to claims 16 and 23 is respectfully requested.

In paragraphs 3 - 5 of the Office Action, claims 14-17, 19, 21-24, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,123 to Rennard, *et al.* (Rennard). In paragraphs 6-7, claims 18 and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rennard in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,288 to King, *et al.* (King).

In response to the Office Action, Applicants have amended claims 14 and 21 to clarify that the in-vehicle navigation device is capable of independently navigating the vehicle to the identified destination based upon the navigation information transferred to it from the first memory remote from said vehicle. Support for this amendment can be found in FIG. 1, in FIG. 3 (items 180 and 200), and throughout the specification (such as at lines 11-20 of page 7). No new matter has resulted from the claim amendments.

Prior to addressing the rejections on the art, a brief review of the Applicants' invention is appropriate. The present invention concerns a vehicle navigation method and apparatus for navigating a vehicle using in-vehicle navigation equipment. More particularly, a publicly accessible Web site can be accessed using a computing device, such as a personal computer or cellular telephone, that is remote from the vehicle. Using the Web site, one or more destinations can be selected. The Web site can then determine navigation information for the selected destinations. Navigation information includes the geographical coordinates of the selected destinations. The navigation information can be stored in a memory location that can be either within the computing device or external to the computing device. Thereafter, the navigation

information can be transferred from the first memory to a self-contained, in-vehicle navigation device. The in-vehicle navigation device can use this information to aid a vehicle operator to travel to the selected destinations, without requiring additional input - either from the user or from a remote information source.

The present invention resolves problems relating to the inconvenient and ergonomically unfavorable manner in which data typically is entered into conventional in-vehicle navigation devices. The method also allows vehicle users to contemplate and plan among different destination alternatives in the comfort of their home or office, using a Web site. Further, the computing device used to access the Web site can be a portable computing device, such as a Web-enabled cellular telephone. Using the portable computing device, a traveler on-the-go can select new destination points from any location and is not confined to those initial decisions made at home or in the office when initially planning the trip. Accordingly, trip destinations can be updated using the portable computing device as circumstances change. The traveler need not think of all desired trip destinations when initially planning the trip. Further, the traveler need not utilize the in-vehicle interface for the navigation device.

Turning to the rejections on the art, claims 14-17, 19, 21-24, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,405,123 to Rennard. Rennard teaches a distributed real-time navigation system (column 3, lines 6-7) including a portable navigation device that continuously communicates with a navigational server, wherein the navigational server performs the navigational tasks of the disclosed system and **repetitively provides navigational prompts** to the portable device. This arrangement permits the portable navigation device to function as a thin client or presentation unit for the navigation information processed by the navigation server, even though the portable device is **not capable of independent navigation** (column 2, lines 47-50). Rennard, therein, teaches a system "appropriate for navigation while walking (column 1, lines 23-24) that overcomes the problems (expense and inconvenience as shown at column 1, lines 21-22) of using an in-vehicle navigation device (column 1, line 22). Rennard does not teach, suggest, or contemplate providing navigation information to a self-contained in-vehicle navigation system, which is claimed by the Applicants.

Referring to claims 14 and 21, Applicants explicitly claim the step of:

> transferring said navigation information from said **first memory** (remote from a vehicle) to a **self-contained, in-vehicle navigation device** so that the in-vehicle navigation device **is capable of independently navigating** the vehicle to said at least one destination based upon the navigation information.

The Examiner references column 12, lines 52-54 ("Such information can then be used to provide input to **the** navigation system {referring to the distributed navigation server 212} for later use through the wireless device 202") of Rennard for teaching this limitation. The cited navigation system is a distributed navigation system remote from a user. The distributed navigation server 212 **requires** a local interface (like wireless device 202) in order to be capable of interacting with a user. In contrast, an **in-vehicle navigation device** is a device that **directly interfaces** with a user (when guiding a user to a destination).

At column 5, lines 48-50, Rennard teaches that an **essential** function of a wireless device 202 (such as a cellular telephone, as indicated at column 5, lines 13-40) is to provide an interface between the navigation system of this invention (remotely located from the user) and a user. The user interface device is "not burdened with carrying all the necessary information for proper navigation." as noted at column 7, lines 15-17. Accordingly, Rennard fails to contemplate or teach a **self-contained** navigation device. Instead, Rennard teaches that a remotely located server receives input and responsively conveys navigational prompts (iteratively) to a "dumb" presentation device or wireless device 202.

Moreover, Rennard fails to contemplate an **in-vehicle navigation device**, but instead teaches a wireless interface 202 that can be carried by a person, which is "appropriate for navigation while walking (column 1, lines 23-24)." The teachings of Rennard are explicitly designed to overcomes the problems (expense and inconvenience as shown at column 1, lines 21-22) of using an in-vehicle navigation device (column 1, line 22). Consequently, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, Rennard teaches **away** from an **in-vehicle navigation device**, as evidenced by FIGS. 1-14 of Rennard.

Applicants further note that the teachings of Rennard are inappropriate for the purpose of the Applicants claimed invention. Rennard teaches that a portable presentation unit 202 is to

maintain a constant communication link (via networks 208 and 216) with the distributed navigation servers 212 in order for the real-time navigation system to function. Applicants system is a **self-contained** in-vehicle navigation device that is capable of **independently** navigating the vehicle to a destination, once the navigation information for the destination has been provided. It would be **extremely** significant to **require** the in-vehicle navigation system to be in **constant communication** with a remotely located navigation system, as taught by Rennard. Many operational environments in which an in-vehicle navigation system is designed to operate, such as a remote roadway, can fall outside zones for reliable wireless communications. If following the teachings of Rennard, an navigation system **cannot** function outside wireless communication zones. Accordingly, the Rennard system has significant operational limitations not included in the present invention.

Referring to claims 19 and 26, Applicants teach "providing a **portable storage media**" (like a CD or floppy disk) though which the navigation information is to be transferred to the in-vehicle navigation system. The Examiner cites column 5, lines 40-50 as teaching this limitation, which is not present in Rennard. The cited portion references that "modular attachments" can enhance the wireless device, so that the wireless device (which may otherwise lack needed capabilities) can perform the functions stated in Rennard. A modual attachment, for example, can be a wireless modem to permit the wireless device 202 to "carry out essential functions of providing an interface between the remote distributed navigation system 212 and the user" (column 5, lines 47-50). Rennard fails to teach or suggest that navigation information can be transferred via a portable storage media.

As Rennard fails to teach each claimed limitation of the Applicants invention, the 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) rejection to claims 14-17, 19, 21-24, and 26 should be withdrawn, which action is respectfully requested.

Turning to paragraphs 6-7, the Examiner has rejected claims 18 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rennard in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,721,288 to King, *et al.* (King). King teaches improved techniques for reducing delays faced by users of mobile devices due to unavailability of wireless networks. King can be used, for example, to reduce wait times when browsing the Internet via a mobile device, as noted at column 3, lines 21-30.

Teachings of Rennard and King should not be combined for purposes of the Applicants' invention as claimed. The only commonality between the Applicants claimed invention and Rennard is that both disclose methodologies for navigating. Rennard solves problems unrelated to those solved by the present invention; using systems vastly different from those of the present invention, and using techniques incompatible with the present invention.

Rennard teaches a system not capable of satisfactorily operating within a self-contained in-vehicle navigation system (as a constant communication connection must be maintained with a remote navigation server), as claimed by the Applicants. Rennard is silent as to the salient characteristics of the Applicants invention, which is inputting navigation information including a destination via a convenient input mechanism, adding further navigation information related to the user provided input derived from a remote site (Web site), and transferring the gathered navigation information to an in-vehicle navigation system so that the in-vehicle navigation system can be used to navigate the vehicle to the selected destination. Applicants overcome the input problems with conventional in-vehicle navigation systems, which Rennard does not.

King directs no teachings towards navigation, which is the only common ground between Rennard and the present invention. Instead, King relates to the filed of wireless networks, and more particularly, to operation of wireless mobile devices during unavailability of wireless networks, as noted at column 1, lines 28-30. King is silent as to navigation devices. King is also silent as to in-vehicle navigation system. Appreciably, the Applicants claimed invention relates to "systems and methods for vehicle navigation, and more particularly to onboard navigation systems," as stated on page 1, lines 11-12 of the present invention. Applicants assert that King is unrelated to the Applicants invention and should not be considered within an analogous field of endeavor as the Applicants claimed invention.

Further, King fails to cure the deficiencies of Rennard. Neither King, Rennard, nor any combination thereof teach, suggest, or contemplate "an in-vehicle navigation device" or any methodologies specifically directed toward such a device. Neither King, Rennard, nor any combination thereof teach suggest or contemplate transferring navigation data into an in-vehicle navigation device so that the in-vehicle device can **independently** navigate to a location

designated within the navigation data. Accordingly, the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections as to claims 18 and 25 should be withdrawn, which action is respectfully requested.

The Applicants believe that the application in its present form, including claims 14-27, is now in full condition for allowance, which action is respectfully requested. The Applicants request that the Examiner call the undersigned if clarification is needed on any matter within this Amendment, or if the Examiner believes a telephone interview would expedite the prosecution of the subject application to completion.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 16 Aug 2004

Gregory A. Nelson, Registration No. 30,577
Brian K. Buchheit, Registration No. 52,667
Richard A. Hinson, Registration No. 47,652
AKERMAN SENTERFITT
Post Office Box 3188
West Palm Beach, FL 33402-3188
Telephone: (561) 653-5000